ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

Date

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1. HARRY FITZWATER 5E58		
2.		
3. One of the NAPA		
4. recommendations I endorse		
5. (per everybody's lead file)		

Mr. May

Registry

DD/A Registry
File Personnel

Action		File		Note and Return	
Approval		For Clearance		Per Conversation	
As Requested		For Correction		Prepare Reply	
Circulate		For Your Information		See Me	
Comment		Investigate		Signature	
Coordination		Justify			

REMARKS

is putting Omego on the Qualification Board. I think we should move ahead and just do that. What do you think?

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
DIW	6/19
	Phone No.

5041-102
☆ U.S. G.P.O. 1977-241-530/3090

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

Distribution:
Orig RS - D/Pers
    1 - DDA Subj
    1 - DIW Chrono

DDA:DIWortman (19 Jun 79)

DD/A 79-0258/9

18 MAY 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

FROM   :   Don I. Wortman
                    Deputy Director for Administration

SUBJECT   :   NAPA Report

1.   Overall, the opinions of my Office Directors as well as myself, are that the NAPA report is quite thorough and comprehensive, given the short time frame in which it was prepared. We are in general agreement with most of the recommendations, although in several areas we believe that different solutions would be more effective to solve the problems that NAPA identified. Implementation of the recommendations must take into account current budgetary and staffing limitations. Where additional resources would be required to adopt a proposal, I will attempt to obtain these resources.

One central theme runs through the report as a whole and that is centralization of policy and decentralization of implementation. I support this philosophy solidly and believe that the development, codification and promulgation of personnel management policies should ultimately reside with the DDCI but that once approved, the operating mechanisms should be decentralized to the Office level, or, in certain areas, to the Deputy Director level. The Office of Personnel should play a strong role, from the initial stages on, in the development of policy and the Director of Personnel should sit on the EXCOMM whenever items pertaining to or affecting personnel management are discussed. Once policies have been approved by the DDCI and implemented, the Office of Personnel should develop and maintain an effective monitoring system which would have senior-level support in situations where corrective action is deemed necessary.

2.   The following comments reflect my views or the views of Offices within this Directorate on specific recommendations:

a. <u>Issue of Single and Dual Systems</u>

In the Report, NAPA supports our flexible
staffing system wherein understaffing and over-
slotting are permissible. There is little
argument that this flexibility is a valuable asset
to our system, particularly insofar as the PRA is
concerned. There is equal value in the ability to
"test" employees in higher graded positions but
perhaps it would be useful to consider a time-frame
in which "undergradings" could be rectified. Under
such a system, an employee, who because of performance
(not because of external factors such as personnel
reductions) was not promoted to the higher grade of
the position within 24 or 36 months, would be reassigned
to a position matching his or her grade. This would
free headroom for deserving employees and be consistent
with the basic policy of equal pay for equal work.
Also, it would parallel PRA policy where there is a
60-month limitation.

b. <u>Career Planning and Development</u>

(1) One of the major areas of the Study concerned
the development of executive/managerial talent within
the Agency. The primary emphasis of this program is
planned rotation of senior officers to expose them to
the various disciplines of the Agency. This concept
is an extremely valid one which should be implemented
through some mechanism.

The NAPA Team recommended dividing senior positions
and personnel into three categories:

       1. Executive/Managerial
       2. Executive/Professional
       3. Executive/Program

The Executive Committee (EXCOMM) would have direct
supervision over Category 1 with review and recommending
authority to the DCI on Categories 2 and 3. The PDP
would be retained in a simplified form to identify
"feeder group" employees.

I believe the recommendation of three categories
to be a good one; however, the third category, "Executive/
Program", needs redefining or clarification. In
discussions with various individuals, it became evident

-2-

that each had a different interpretation of the
type of personnel/positions which this would include.
The concensus seemed to be that it would include
those positions where a high degree of substantive
expertise was required along with considerable
managerial ability.

One of the major problems we had with the NAPA
recommendations concerned the role of the EXCOMM and
DDCI/DCI with respect to executive career planning
and development. We believe their role should be
limited to approval of the program initially and then
oversight following implementation.

In establishing this program it is proposed that
each supergrade, SPS and EP position be identified as
falling into one of the three categories; in turn, each
supergrade, SPS and EP careerist would also be so
identified. (Note: provisions would have to be made
to allow individuals to cross over to another track.)

The primary document in implementing this would be
a part of the PDP. We envision the PDP being composed
of two parts: (1) GS-13 to GS-15 "feeder" employees and
(2) Supergrade, SPS and EP employees. The latter part
would be prepared by the Senior Career Board in each
Directorate and the "feeder" portion prepared by the
Offices. As recommended by NAPA, the PDP, in any case,
should be streamlined, eliminating the statistical
portion and making it a flexible working paper. EXCOMM
would serve as the reviewing body for Part 2 and the
Directorate Board as the reviewing body for Part 1.

(2) In the context of career development, NAPA also
discussed the establishment of "occupational families
across Directorate lines" to encourage rotation and
better use of vacancy notices. These recommendations
met with general approval with the idea that greater
mobility would benefit the employee as well as the
Agency. Regarding Vacancy Notices, it is believed that
an Agency-wide policy should be established. At the
present time, some offices use it for all positions while
others use it sparingly if at all.

-3-

c. <u>Better Mechanisms to Deal with Return from
Overseas, LWOP and Personnel Reductions</u>

There is general concensus that a better mechanism
for placing LWOP and overseas returnees and those
affected by personnel reductions would certainly be wel-
come. However, the concept of "absolute priority on
vacancies" appears to be too rigid a policy to blend
into the Agency's flexible career system. Assignment
of overseas returnees should be automatically resolved
in the checkerboard assignment system wherein people
going overseas vacate positions to which returnees can
be assigned. In most cases where LWOP is approved for
a short term (up to 90 days) the position is left
vacant for the employee. However, in extended LWOP
periods, up to three years, this practice is not feasible.
If the recommendation were adopted, there could be
instances where, when the person returns, the available
vacancies would be ones for which the individual is not
qualified or not the most qualified. The same situation
also applies to individuals affected by personnel
reductions. Adoption of NAPA's recommendation would
conflict to some degree with (1) skill and ability match-
ups, (2) minority employee placement, and (3) external
hiring policies. This recommendation smacks of "bumping
rights" under Civil Service and adoption of this would
run counter to the previously supported "rank in person"
concept.

d. <u>Flow-Through</u>

The NAPA Team had difficulty with the concept of
flow-through which is reinforced by our Offices' own
lack of clarity on this subject. The flow-through
principle is directly related to employee evaluations
and promotions which are discussed in the next section.
NAPA did recommend that we reinstate the effort with
the Office of Personnel Management to gain status for
Agency employees wishing to transfer to other Federal
agencies. I believe this may not be in the best
interests of the Agency since there would certainly
have to be some reciprocity on the Agency's part. This
could harm rather than benefit us in the long run. As
it stands now, Agency personnel do transfer to other
Federal agencies and frequently at a grade increase.
The lack of status does not really appear to be
detrimental to our qualified personnel.

- 4 -

e. Employee Evaluation and Assessment

NAPA's difficulty with the flow-through concept most likely results from the almost universal perception among Agency managers and employees that certain concepts of the Uniform Promotion System are ill advised. At the outset, any policy which calls for separating good employees solely to hire and/or promote young employees will meet with strong opposition. Add to that the erosion of authority of line management by making panel decisions binding in promoting their employees, and an excessive amount of panel and board meetings required for monthly promotions and the opposition becomes deafening.

This is not an unqualified indictment of the Uniform Promotion System as there are certain aspects which warrant retention. The practice of goal setting for promotions with attendant publication of the targets, the predetermined schedule for promotions and publication of criteria are positive factors. However, I believe these factors could be retained in a more flexible promotion and ranking system.

NAPA makes several recommendations which could be adopted to give the Agency a uniform but flexible system. The establishment of uniform precepts for promotion panels would be valuable along with certain criteria which would be common to all career services such as level of performance, communication skills and judgment. Elements unique to certain sub-groups such as flexibility and technical knowledge could be added to the basic list where appropriate.

NAPA also recommends reducing the detail in ranking to only that needed in decision making, particularly for trainees below the journeyman levels. I have interpreted this as meaning the elimination of numerical ranking and, in lieu thereof, placing employees in one of the five current categories, i.e., HP, MD, VC, LP and SS. If adopted, I believe that the top ten percent and bottom ten percent should be identified to high-light the strong employees and to indicate those for whom career counseling and training is needed. This lower ten percent should not be used, however, as the sole basis for reductions in force.

In its report, the study recommends that line management become more involved in personnel management. I agree with this belief and particularly as it applies to promotions and rankings. Formerly, Office Heads had the authority to promote and approve rankings. I believe this authority should be reinstated.

While the report did not address the timing of promotions, I believe this, too, should be liberalized. I believe that each sub-group should be required to establish and publish a promotion schedule; however, these would not necessarily be the same for each sub-group. This would allow sub-groups to rank and promote several grades, at one time, i.e., GS-07-11, thus reducing the number of panel meetings required.

Also, while a target number of promotion is of interest to employees and should be published, the concept of terminating personnel to produce promotion headroom should be eliminated.

f. Recruitment

The NAPA Team had a number of recommendations in this area. All those referring to the mechanics of the system such as reducing processing steps, quicker referral of applications to component personnel officers, retention of applicant files and others, appear valid and warrant adoption. The recommendation that uniform qualification standards be adopted such as the PATB and other testing devices is also valid. However, I have difficulty in agreeing with the concept that a person's overall potential should not be a factor if the individual qualifies for a specific single position. This would be fine if an individual would be content to remain at one grade, in one position and in one office throughout his career. However, this is rarely the case and would create considerable discontent as that employee watches his peers moving up and around. Also, this concept is in basic conflict with the Agency's career system wherein many officers are rotated as much as possible.

Insofar as Career Trainee recruitment is concerned, I support both recommendations in the report. Providing "retreat rights" to internal employees would be similar

-6-

to the system now used successfully by the Office
of Communications. Entry of personnel above
GS-11 would certainly expand our pool of applicants
numerically as well as increasing the qualification
ranges of the applicants.

g. Equal Employment Opportunity

I agree completely with the three recommendations
made by NAPA in the EEO area. Setting of goals for
minorities and women requires positive action by the
Offices, thus eliminating the possibility of letting
EEO slip to the back burner.

While I know that the PATB has been carefully
prepared and reviewed to eliminate racial bias, I
believe an external study would lay to rest this
allegation.

Likewise, I realize that minority status is not a
factor in the deliberations of the Personnel Evaluation
Review Board or the Applicant Review Panel; however,
many employees perceive these bodies as having
mystique and secretive powers. Allowing the D/EEO to
sit on these boards would help to alleviate these
misperceptions.

h. Personnel Policy Development and Implementation

As indicated above, I believe the DDCI, with EXCOMM
in an advisory role, should be involved in policy
decisions in the personnel management area with the
Office of Personnel as the staff entity. I see no real
need for a change in our regulatory procedures since,
regulations are prepared only after policy decisions
have been made. I know of no instance where the
regulation policy differs from the policy approved by
the DDCI or DCI. A formal signature requirement by the
DDCI on regulations would merely add time to an already
lengthy process. Also, regulations, as now written,
are separated into policy, procedures and responsibilities
sections.

i. Manpower Planning

There was unanimous agreement within the Directorate
with the recommendation regarding the restructuring of
the APP. As proposed, the initial step is to determine
what the DCI and DDCI want to know and then, design the
APP so that most of its content is readily obtainable
from computerized records.

-7-

j.   Roles and Relationships in Personnel Management.

There are several recommendations in this section
which I will address specifically; the remainder can
be addressed more generally.

(1)   The role of the Personnel Officer is
one of considerable concern to me and I agree
that his/her role should be clearly defined and,
more importantly, understood by Agency managers.
Competent personnel officers should not have to
wait to be invited to career management, planning,
PMCD sessions, etc.   Their presence should be
understood.   Those components who use their
personnel officers as paper processors and to clean
up difficult situations caused by lack of staff
work and knowledge by the managers are only
hurting themselves.   I believe a focal point in
the Office of Personnel for operating personnel
officers would be beneficial and enhance the
image of the component personnel officer as well
as giving that officer a focal point for guidance.

(2) I agree that better coordination between
the Offices of Training and Personnel would be
helpful and, in this regard, suggest that a
senior "MT" careerist be detailed to the Office
of Personnel for six months to assist in the
implementation of this Report.

(3)   NAPA also recommends that perhaps training
officers could be assigned to various components
to advise on training matters.   In lieu of this,
I believe that the assignment of one training
officer to each of the Directorates to serve as
Senior Training Officer would help to alleviate
the problems described in the Report.

(4) In the remainder of the Report, NAPA
makes several recommendations concerning
strengthening the role of the Office of Personnel,
giving more responsibility and authority to
line managers and reducing the costs of the
personnel management system.   I stand behind these

-8-

concepts. Simultaneously, however, NAPA recommends the establishment of a new management staff under the DDCI. I find this difficult to understand in light of the recommendations stated above and cannot endorse it. I believe the Office of Personnel has the capability to provide the needed advice and should do so in concert with the EXCOMM and DDCI.

/s/ C. D. May

Don I. Wortman

Attachments
    Comments frm ADOS, DTR, D/CO,
        D/MS, D/OL, D/OF, & MG/CMO

Distribution:
    Orig - Adse
        1 - DDA subj wo/att
        1 - DDA chrono
        1 - DIW chrono
        1 - CMO/DDA w/att

STAT O/CMO/DDA: [   ] pao 30 Apr 79)